UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/589,360	08/14/2006	Ryuji Hamada	062894	6821	
	of the state of th			EXAMINER	
1250 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW			SLIFKA, COLIN W		
SUITE 700 WASHINGTON, DC 20036			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			4162		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			07/08/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/589,360	HAMADA ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	COLIN W. SLIFKA	4162			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timuser, ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE!	l. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 Ju This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-5 and 12-16 is/are solutions. 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 6-11 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or are subject to restriction and/or are subject to by the Examine 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ acceptable.	withdrawn from consideration. r election requirement. r.	Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the answer Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 08/14/2006, 04/04/2007, and 07/03/2007	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	te			



Application No.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election with traverse of Group I in the reply filed on 6/13/08 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that a thorough search of the elected group would necessarily encompass the search an examination of the other groups, and therefore is without serious burden. This is not found persuasive because there is no requirement in PCT 13.1 and 13.2 of a burden in searching the entire claims to establish a prima facie case of a lack of unity. Applicants have made no argument that the cited references do not disclose the special technical feature or that the asserted feature is not a special technical feature.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamada et al (US 2003/0079805) in view of Nishiuchi et al (US 6,376,089). Hamada teaches applicant's R-T-M-B rare earth permanent magnet with the same elements and ranges; and further teaches a coating formed on the magnet via use of a silicone material which carries flaky fine particles. Hamada does not specifically teach the use of a silane and/or a partial hydrolyzate thereof or more specifically

trialkoxysilane or dialkoxysilane as the carrier for the particles. Nishiuchi clearly teaches the use of a fine metal powder with a carrier of vinyltriethoxysilane (col. 3, lines 1-3) to form a corrosion-resistant film for the rare earth permanent magnet. The average particle size ranges from 0.001-0.1 nanometers (col. 4, lines 9-11). Nishiuchi also teaches that the film formed is dense, is crack resistant, and has an excellent close adhesion to the magnet (col. 4, lines 18-37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a silane carrier as taughy by Nishiuchi as the carrier in Hamada's corrosion resistant film to provide a dense film which is crack resistant and has excellent adhesion properties.

Hamada also teaches the limitations of the particles and film of claims 8 and 9.

Regarding claim 11, Hamada teaches the treatment of the magnet's surface by methods of pickling, caustic cleaning and shot blasting.

Claims 6-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoshi et al (US 2003/0041920) in view of Hamada et al (US 2003/0079805). Hoshi teaches and R-T-B rare earth permanent magnet with impurities consistent with applicant's M-site metals. The ranges are within applicant's ranges, as R between 27-34 wt%, B between 0.5-2 wt%, and the balance being T (par. 28, lines 1-6). Regarding applicant's M-site metal, one example that Hoshi teaches is that the content of Al is preferably 0.02-2 wt% (par. 33, line 1). Hoshi teaches the use of silane coupling agents such as vinyltriethoxysilane and others to form a film on the magnet to aid in corrosion resistance. Hoshi does not include particles in the silane film. Hamada teaches applicant's R-T-M-B rare earth permanent magnet with the same elements and ranges and further teaches the treating of the magnet's surface with a liquid comprising a flaky fine powder of applicant's claimed elements or an alloy thereof to provide corrosion resistance. Hamada teaches that the presence of the particles is

more resistant to heat and provides good shielding effects (pp 0027). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a flaky fine powder as taught by Hamada in Hoshi's surface treatment to provide improved heat resistance and shielding effects.

Hamada also teaches the limitations of the particles of claim 8.

Regarding claim 10, Hoshi teaches heating the magnet to 60°C (par. 73, line 4).

Regarding claim 11, Hamada teaches the treatment of the magnet's surface by methods of pickling, caustic cleaning and shot blasting. Hoshi teaches the pretreatment of the magnet with an aqueous alkaline solution (par. 71, lines12-14).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to COLIN W. SLIFKA whose telephone number is (571)270-5830. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 10:00AM-4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jennifer McNeil can be reached on 571-272-1540. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/589,360

Art Unit: 4162

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Page 5

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system,

see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system,

contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like

assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/COLIN W SLIFKA/

Examiner, Art Unit 4162

/Jennifer McNeil/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4162